

REMARKS

Therefore, claims 1 and 4-15 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1 and 14 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

*Rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)*

Claims 1 and 4-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by King et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,169,498.<sup>1</sup> This rejection is traversed.

Among the problems recognized and solved by Applicants' claimed invention is that too much information may be displayed on a display to aid navigation, such as a map, and that therefore the display may become confusing as it becomes difficult to find meaningful information.<sup>2</sup> According to an aspect of Applicants' claimed invention, to decide whether a full presentation or a limited presentation is to be made on a display, a proximity of the presentation device to the location assigned to an information unit is used. For example, according to an aspect of the Applicants' invention, access is permitted only to a limited extent to the display device only, such as, by display of a representative icon, when a relatively small distance separates the physical location of the presentation device and the location assigned to information unit, or full access may be permitted, such as for example when the physical location of the display device substantially corresponds to the location assigned to the information unit.

The Office Action Summary fails to mention claim 8 as pending or as rejected. However, Page 5 does explain that claim 8 is rejected. Claim 8 is pending in the present Application, and appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the Office Action Summary.

The present discussion illustrates aspects of Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants do not represent that every embodiment of Applicants' claimed invention necessarily embodies or performs the solutions herein discussed or addresses the problems herein identified.

For at least the following reasons, the cited references neither disclose nor teach Applicants' claimed invention. By way of example, independent claims 1 and 14 require controlling the presentation of the information unit, such that a full presentation of the information unit is permitted when the physical location of the presentation device and the location to which the information unit is assigned are substantially equal, and permitting only a limited presentation of the information unit when a relatively small distance separates the physical location of the presentation device and the location to which the information unit is assigned.

King discloses communication of location-specific messages, such that a portable device, such as a personal digital assistant, receives a code that uniquely identifies a location-specific message, for example in museum or at an airport (King, Abstract, column 4, lines 24-34). King discloses that when the portable device is brought within the range of a radio beacon at the location, the relevant code or codes are presented on the display of the portable device, and thereby the user is able to select and initiate the appropriate location-specific message stored in the memory of the portable device (King, column 5, lines 26-32).

The Examiner cites King, column 40, lines 40-55, and column 5, lines 53-65, which disclose that the user may select a depth of commentary (or language of commentary) that is desired.

King does not disclose or suggest that the extent of the information made available is determined with reference to proximity. As discussed, King allows the user to select a depth of commentary. King is not directed to controlling what portion of the information unit is to be displayed based on relative distance or proximity.

In fact, King makes no distinction between a location that is substantially equal to a target location and a location that is separated by a relatively small distance from the target location. Clearly, King does not disclose or suggest controlling the presentation of the information unit such that a full presentation of the information unit is permitted when the physical location of the presentation device and the location to which the information unit is assigned are substantially equal, and permitting only a limited presentation of the information unit when a relatively small distance separates the physical location of the presentation device and the location to which the information unit is assigned, as *inter alia* required by independent claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, King does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1 and 14.

In fact, King belongs to the conventional art recognized by Applicants' claimed invention, because King does not disclose or suggest the problems recognized and solved by Applicants' claimed invention. By way of example, King does not disclose or suggest the problem of too much information being displayed on a display to aid navigation. As discussed, King does not disclose or suggest distinguishing between a location that is substantially equal to a target location and a location that is separated by a relatively small distance from the target location when it comes to the extent of the display of information. Therefore, King does not even remotely disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1 and 14.

Claims 4-13 and 15 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and thus incorporate novel and non-obvious features thereof. Therefore, claims 4-13 and 15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Application is now believed to be allowable and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection and to allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions about the within remarks, or about the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



George Brieger  
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

TSG:bat